

## REMARKS

In the Final Office Action of April 17, 2007, claims 1-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,424,357 (hereinafter “Frulla et al.”). In response, Applicant has amended the independent claims 1 and 20 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited reference. In addition, claims 6, 9, 10, 14, 16-18, 25, 28, 29, 33, 35-37, 39 and 43 have been canceled and claims 11, 13, 15, 19, 30, 32, 34, 38 and 40 have been amended. In view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of the pending claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11-13, 15, 19-24, 26, 27, 30-32, 34, 38 and 40-42.

### A. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 1 and 20

The Office Action has rejected the original independent claims 1 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Frulla et al. In response, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 20 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited reference. In particular, the independent claims 1 and 20 have been amended to include the limitations of “*modifying said initial conditions in said log file in response to user editing of said log file so that a modified initial state of said computer environment is automatically created on replay using modified initial conditions in said log file when said log file is loaded,*” which are not disclosed in the cited reference of Frulla et al. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the amended independent claims 1 and 20 are not anticipated by the cited reference of Frulla et al. and requests that these amended independent claims be allowed.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); MPEP §2131.

The cited reference of Frulla et al. in column 8, lines 14-17, states that “[a]gain, using the mouse 20 the user 15 activates the desired window thereby placing the application software in a known, initialized state as shown in block 56.” The block 56 in Fig. 2 of Frulla et al. states “activate desired window & initialize mouse position”. However, the cited reference of Frulla et al. does not disclose “*modifying said initial conditions in said log file in response to user editing of said log file so that a modified initial state of said computer environment is automatically created on replay using modified initial conditions in said log file when said log file is loaded,*” as recited in the amended independent claims 1 and 20. Therefore, the amended independent claims 1 and 20 are not anticipated by Frulla et al. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the amended independent claim 1 and 20 be allowed.

## II. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-5, 7, 8, 11-13, 15, 19, 21-24, 26, 27, 30-32, 34, 38 and 40-42

Each of the dependent claims 2-5, 7, 8, 11-13, 15, 19, 21-24, 26, 27, 30-32, 34, 38 and 40-42 depends on one of the amended independent claims 1 and 20. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the claim amendments and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Denny Jaeger

Date: May 19, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/

Thomas H. Ham

Registration No. 43,654

Telephone: (925) 249-1300